

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2006

Appl. No.: 09/872,893  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2006

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action of July 25, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. No claims have been amended, no claims have been canceled and no new claims have been added. Claims 1-3, 5-19, and 21-32 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 and 17 recite, *inter alia*, “redisplaying first web page, wherein content associated with the selected anchor is elided” Logan does not teach or suggest such a feature.

The Office Action cites column 2, lines 21-32 and 42-52 of Logan as allegedly describing such a feature. Applicant finds no such teaching or suggestion. Under Logan, the user activates a link on any given page (“first web page”). Before the content of the linked hypertext document (“second web page”) is displayed, it is compared with a stored table of predetermined text strings. See column 2, lines 35-37. If a text matching a stored string is found, each item of matching text is replaced with a predetermined replacement string associated with the detected text. See column 2, lines 37-40. The replacement string may, *inter alia*, rewrite or eliminate the imbedded text or imbedded format that would have otherwise appeared on the second web page. See column 2, lines 42-52. In other words, the replacement string only replaces content *on the second web page*, not the first web page as claimed. Logan thus does not teach Claim 1 and Claim 17, which recite, *inter alia*, “redisplaying the *first web page*, wherein content associated

Appln. No.: 09/872,893  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2006

with the selected anchor is elided” (emphasis added). Under Logan, it would be impossible for the replacement string to “rewrite, or eliminate the original imbedded text” *on the first web page*, as claimed, since this only occurs after comparing the predetermined table with the content of the first web page.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-24, 27, 31, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-24, 27, 31, and 32 are allowable for all the reasons given above concerning their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features cited therein.

For example, with respect to claims 6, 16, 22 and 32, Logan does not teach “displaying a second web page in a browser window other than that in which the first web page is displayed.” The Office Action cites column 14, lines 18-25 as teaching this feature. However, there is no mention of a second *web page*. Instead, a “pop-up menu” which includes, *inter alia*, “Insert Link” or “Edit Link” options, appears, which is wholly distinct from a web page. The office action also cites column 14, lines 55-59 as supporting the assertion that Logan teaches claims 6 and 22, but again, there is only discussion of a “pop-up menu which supplies the developer with option of replacing displayed text or inserting a tag at the position in the displayed page indicated by the mouse click” which, again, is distinctly different than a second *web page*.

***Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)***

Appln. No.: 09/872,893  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2006

Claims 9, 10, 25, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Martínez et al. U.S. Patent 6,271,846.

Claims 9, 10, 25, and 26 are allowable for all the reasons given above concerning their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. In addition, the additionally cited references do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Logan. For example, the cited references at least do not teach or suggest the claimed elision on the first web page. The directory tree as taught by Martinez is wholly distinct from elision. Furthermore, Martinez does not discuss elision on web pages.

Claims 12 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Cezar et al. U.S. Patent 6,161,127.

Claims 12 and 28 are allowable for all the reasons given above concerning their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. In addition, the additionally cited references do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Logan. For example, the cited references at least do not teach or suggest the claimed elision on the first web page.

Claims 13, 14, 29, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. U.S. Patent 5,761,683, as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Freishtat et al. U.S. Patent 5,945,989.

Claims 13, 14, 29, and 30 are allowable for all the reasons given above concerning their respective base claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. In addition,

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 24 2006

Appln. No.: 09/872,893  
Amendment dated October 24, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2006

the additionally cited references do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Logan. For example, the Office Action cites the claims of Freishtat (column 23, lines 55-63) to teach that content may be selectively elided from the web page via user command inputs. The Office Action improperly assumes that "commands" as recited in column 23, lines 55-63 is analogous to "certain conditions" which may include webpage displaying errors. However, at no point does Freishtat suggest that "certain conditions" encompass webpage displaying errors. Column 9, lines 14-22 describe how the user can choose to "delete link content" using "commands" but such language falls short of contemplating a scenario where content is or is not elided as a direct result of a user's failed attempt at accessing a second web page.

**CONCLUSION**

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: October 24, 2006

By: /Ross Dannenberg/  
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024  
1001 G Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Tel: (202) 824-3000  
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD/RHL